REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 37-38, 41-42, 44, 47 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over the patent to Alanara in view of the patent to Bobo.

Claims 39-40, 45-46, 52,62, 66-68 and 70-71 are rejected over the patent to Alanar in view of the patent to Bobo and Vanttila.

Claims 43 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over the patent to Alanar in view of the patents to Bobo and Windbladh.

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over the patent to Alanar in view of the patents to Bobo and Söderbacka.

Claim 65 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over the patent to Alanar in view of the patents to Bobo, Vanttila and Söderbacka

Claim 69 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over the patent to

Alanar in view of the patents to Vandttila and Proust.

Claims 63 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over the patent to Alanara in view patents to BObo, Vanttila and Hansson.

At the same time claim 72 is allowed.

The Examiner's indication of the allowance of claim 72 has been gratefully acknowledged, and this claim has been retained as it was.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for the rejection of the claims over the art, applicants amended claims 37 and 71, the independent claims currently on file, to more clearly define the present invention and to distinguish it from the prior art.

It is respectfully submitted that the amended claims 37 and 71 clearly and patentably distinguish the present invention from the references applied by the Examiner.

Claims 37 and 71 have been amended to define that a short

message is transmitted to a central station of a telecommunications network, wherein the short message is addressed to a subscriber of the telecommunications network. Furthermore, the claims define that the notification message is transmitted from the central station to the addressed subscriber of the telecommunications network as a function of the short message transmitted to the central station.

The additional clarification provided now in the independent claims is supported by the specification, in particular page 9, line 33 to page 10, line 3, and page 10, line 20 to page 11, line 2, and page 11, line 9 to line 13.

The patent to Alanara applied by the Examiner does not disclose the use of a central station of a telecommunications network, to which a short message is transmitted. In this patent the short message is transmitted directly to the mobile stations.

Furthermore, in accordance with the patent to Alanara, in contrast to the new features of the present invention as now defined in the independent claims, the short messages are not addressed to a subscriber

of the telecommunications network, but instead are transmitted simultaneously as Point-To-Multipoint Messages of S-BCCH-Channel to a plurality of mobile stations, which scan this S-BCCH-Channel. In accordance with the method defined in claims 37 and 71 a Point-To-Point Transmission to a corresponding address subscriber of the telecommunication system is possible whether he wants to download the short message from the central station or not. In contrast, in accordance with the patent to Alanara, the short message is transmitted to a plurality of users. In accordance with a category field of the short message the individual mobile station can then determine whether the short message corresponds to a category selected by the corresponding mobile station. When this is the case, then the short message received through the broadcast channel S-BCCH is downloaded in a memory of the mobile station or indicated on an indicating device as explained in column 2, lines 15-57 and column 5, line 22 to column 6, line 7 of the patent to Alanara.

Summarizing the differences between the patent to Alanara and the present invention as defined in claims 37 and 71 the following can be specified:

The patent to Alanara, in contrast to the applicant's invention as defined in claims 37 and 71, does not disclose any central station of a telecommunications network, to which a short message is transmitted. The patent to Alanara, in contrast to the present invention as defined in claims 37 and 71 does not disclose a short message which is addressed to a subscriber of a telecommunications network. The subscriber in accordance with the patent to Alanara must determine himself whether a received short message corresponds to a category selected by the subscriber. The patent to Alanara, in contrast to the applicant's invention as defined in claims 37 and 71 does not disclose that an information about the makeup and/or the content of the short message (notification message) can be transmitted from the central station of the telecommunications network to the addressed subscriber. In particular, the patent to Alanara in contrast to the present invention as defined in claims 37 and 71, does not disclose that such a notification message is provided which is different from the short message.

The method in accordance with the present invention as defined in claims 37 and 71 enables, in addition to the execution of a Point-To-Point connection, also a band width-efficient transmission of the short messages. While in accordance with the patent to Alanara the short

messages must be transmitted in each case to a plurality of subscribers so that they can check whether they correspond to categories selected by the mobile stations or by the address subscriber and thereby store and indicate them, in accordance with the present invention as defined in claims 37 and 71 only then a transmission of a short message to a subscriber is required when it is supplied after the receipt of the notification message. The transmission of the notification message requires therefore lower transmission capacity than the transmission of the short message since the notification message requires the first data field of the short message with the informations about the makeup and/or the content of the short message.

It is therefore believed to be clear that the new features of the present invention which are defined in claims 37 and 71 are not disclosed in the patent to Alanara.

The patent to Bobo makes use of a Point-To-Point-Transmission of short messages. Such Short Messages are transmitted first to a central station MSDS and the central station MSDS sends then an e-mail message to the computer of the subscriber, to inform the subscriber about an information message, as explained in column 9, lines 17-23. The

subscriber can establish through the internet a connection to the central station MSDS 10, as shown in a flowchart of Figure 3 of this reference and the associated description. In the course of this internet connection the subscriber has access to HTML-files produced by the MSDS 10, which contain the informations about the messages stored in the mailbox of the subscriber and addressed to the subscriber. These informations can be provided in text form or in image form, as explained in column 9, line 27 to column 10, line 34. These HTML files are produced by the MSDS 10 in accordance with the flowchart of Figures 4a and 4b and as explained in column 10, line 35 to column 11, line 35 of the patent to Bobo.

The following differences take place between the solution proposed in the patent to Bobo and the applicant's invention as defined in claims 37 and 71.

In accordance with the patent to Bobo the individual message transmitted from the central station MSDS 10 to a subscriber is the e-mail message, that declares that the new message is available in the mailbox. Both the inquiry of the subscriber via the makeup of the message provided for it in the mailbox, and also the eventual downloading of this message are

performed through the internet in form of HTML-files and thereby within the framework of the transmission of messages. In contrast, in accordance with the applicant's invention as defined in claims 37 and 71, the information about the makeup and/or the content of the short message is transmitted by means of a notification message from the central station to the subscriber. An access to HTML-files through the internet is therefore not required.

A further difference resides in that in accordance with the present invention as defined in claims 37 and 71 the notification message corresponds to a first data field of the short message transmitted to the central station for the subscriber. In accordance with the patent to Bobo, to the contrary, the central station MSDA produces an HTML-file which declares how a fax message received for a subscriber is made up, as explained in column 9, lines 37-48. The process in accordance with the present invention as defined in claims 37 and 71 is thereby significantly simpler than in the patent to Bobo, since the central station in accordance with claims 37 and 71 must not know or evaluate the content of the short message received for the subscriber, to produce an information about the makeup and/or the content of the short message for the subscriber, but instead the first data field can send the short message as a notification message to the subscriber. The

relatively expensive production of an HTML file, as in the patent to Bobo therefore can be dispensed with. This saves computing time, storage place, and computing power.

It is therefore believed to be clear that the new features of the present invention which are now defined in claims 37 and 71 are also not disclosed in the patent to Bobo.

None of these references disclose a notification message which is different from the short message and transmitted to the subscriber of the telecommunications network and includes information about the makeup and/or content of the short message. None of these references also disclose that, as defined in claims 37 and 71, the information about the makeup and/or the content of the short message is transmitted as a first data field of the short message to the subscriber.

Therefore the new features of the present invention which are defined in claims 37 and 71 can not be derived from the combination of the references.

In connection with the Examiner's rejection of claim 71 over the combination of the patent to Alanara with the patents to Bobo and to Vanttila, it is respectfully submitted that the patent to Vanttila does not disclose such a notification message, and therefore the new features of the present invention as defined in claims 71 can not be derived from this reference, in accordance with which such a notification message is sent only after the request of the subscriber. For this reason the additional feature of claim 71, in accordance with which the notification message is transmitted to the subscriber only when the subscriber before had sent a request signal to the telecommunications network, can not be derived from the combination of the patents to Alanara and Bobo with the patent to Vanttila.

Also, none of the patents to Alanara, Bobo and Vanttila disclose the feature of claims 37 and 71, in accordance with which a notification message which is different from the short message is provided, that is transmitted from a central station of the telecommunications network to the subscriber. None of these references also disclose such a feature, that the information about the makeup and/or the content of the short message is transmitted in form of a first data field of the short message to the subscriber. It is therefore believed to be clear that the new features of

the present invention as defined in claims 37 and 71 can not be considered as obvious from the combination of these three references.

The Examiner's statement that the patent to Bobo discloses sending a preview message before sending the complete message can not be considered as justified. In column 22, lines 25-29 cited by the Examiner no preview message is mentioned. Such a preview message is not transmitted in the patent to Bobo. The preview feature which is disclosed in this reference deals with the HTML-file produced by the MSDS 10 with the information about the makeup of the message inputted for the subscriber, in particular in form of images with a reduced size. This HTML-file however does not form any message which is transmitted through the telecommunications network.

The patent to Bobo therefore does not disclose any preview or notification message contrary to the Examiner's opinion.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is believed that claims 37 and 71 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

As for the dependent claims, these claims depend on the independent claims, they share their presumably allowable features, and therefore they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233